Alright What’s happening out there, Levi Trumbull here, and we have an awesome story for you today, do not go anywhere because you are guys are going to love it. So, a little while back, we talked about the 10-million-dollar defamation lawsuit filed by Washington County Commissioner John Barr against a First Amendment activist Shaun Porter. This whole thing is over a political parody sign, a sign that paid homage to the famous **Hustler Magazine v. Falwell** Supreme Court case. The one where Falwell sued Larry Flynt for a joke Compari Ad talking about how Falwell slept with his mother in an outhouse in Lynchburg, VA, now I believe the case against porter is a SLAPP suit, a lawsuit designed to silence a critic of the government. But today, we're not just talking about the lawsuit; we're talking about the attorney behind it, that’s right, the young female mastermind behind this case is a Maryland lawyer named Sarah Spitalnick who recently graduated from Law School at the University of Baltimore. And after doing my own research, it seems like to me, that the Porter lawsuit isn't a fluke; it's a pattern. A pattern of what I can only describe as legal shenanigans and, quite frankly, attorney amateur hour. So, sit back as we unpack Sarah Spitalnick’s brief collection of legal failures and questionable cases that she has been a part of. Also, because it’s my opinion that her cases are super silly, for the purposes of this video I am going to be calling her “Silly Sarah.”

---

## Part 1: The Epic Fail Against King & Spalding

**LEVI TRUMBULL:** So, Let's start at the beginning of Silly Sarah’s journey in law. Court documents show that as a first-year law student of University of Baltimore, Sarah Spitalnick, decided to sue a major international law firm, King & Spalding. This is a massive firm with law offices all over the world, a true Goliath of the legal profession. Because you know… when you’re in law school, and you want to be a lawyer, what a great idea it is to sue a major law firm that is internationally recognized, that will really get your foot in the door. So Silly Sarah brought the lawsuit on claims of unlawful employment discrimination. She alleged in her lawsuit that she, was a "straight white female,"

was "deterred from applying" for a summer internship by the law firm because the job posting required candidates to "have an ethnically or culturally diverse background or be a member of the LGBT community". So, Silly Sarah, believed she was "clearly" unqualified to meet that requirement.

Now, if you're a first-year law student taking on a titan like that, you'd think you'd have your ducks in a row. You'd have to come correct. But according to the memorandum opinion from the federal court, Sarah did not even come close to bringing a legitimate case. The judge's opinion is a masterpiece of judicial shade. It gets right to the point: the case was dismissed for one of the most basic, fundamental reasons in law: a lack of subject-matter jurisdiction. The judge's opinion on the matter states Silly Sarah "never sought" the internship she was suing over, which is why she lacked standing to sue. In my opinion, it's like suing a restaurant for a meal you never ordered, then being shocked when the waiter says you can't sue them for not giving it to you. The court's decision was a complete legal spanking on Silly Sarah’s Silly White Butt, it was a dismissal so profound that it didn't even really get to the merits of the case. In my opinion, this set the stage for a career of what seems to be a complete misunderstanding of how the law works by Silly Sarah.

---

## Part 2: The Jacob Clere Fiasco & The "Huge" Judgment

**LEVI TRUMBULL:** Next up on the Silly Sarah’s Wall of Shame is the case involving a guy named Jacob Clere. We have documents from the Maryland Home Improvement Commission—the state-level body that oversees contractors work and they show already had problems. According to a "Proposed Order" from the MHIC, he was found to have performed work in an "unworkmanlike, incomplete, or inadequate manner". And as a result, the Commission awarded the claimant, Robert Hess, a judgment of in the specific amount: **$2,100.00**.

Now, in addition to that finding from MHIC, a different court case shows that Jacob Clere was involved in a breach of contract

case where he was the plaintiff with Silly Sarah as his Attorney. But it was the defendants, David Anderson and Legacy Pool and Spa, LLC, who won a HUGE verdict against JACOB on their counter-complaint against him. The jury awarded the counter-plaintiffs **$26,980.00** as a result of a breach of contract and an additional **$1,300.00** for "Conversion". The total judgment against Jacob Clere and his company, Clere Services LLC, this is a huge amount of money for a contractor to lose. And to make matters worse, the documents provided show that Jacob Clere then filed for bankruptcy. It's my opinion that the legal action Silly Sarah helped Jacob Clere pursue backfired spectacularly against him, leaving him with judgments against him and a bankruptcy filing. Good work Sarah! Hopefully you returned all the money he paid you so that he can pay off that judgement he now owes.

**Part 3: Blake Hadel v. Kyleigh Midkiff**

**LEVI TRUMBULL:** Now, if you want a masterclass in how not to practice law, you have to look at the *Hadel v. Midkiff* defamation case. In my opinion, this is the centerpiece of Silly Sarah's "Wall of Shame." The documents reveal that Sarah Spitalnick represented a guy named Blake Hadel who sued a woman, Kyleigh Midkiff, for defamation. The suit was brought after Kyleigh Midkiff made allegations of sexual misconduct against Hadel on social media, a claim that, according to the documents, multiple other women had also made.

They took this case to a **2-day trial**. And after just two days, the judge delivered a legal haymaker: a directed verdict in favor of Kyleigh Midkiff. Now, a directed verdict is not just a loss; it is a complete legal demolition. It's when a judge decides that, based on the evidence presented, no reasonable person could have sided with the plaintiff. It's a statement by the court that your case had no merit from the get-go.

And here's where we get to the real meat of it. The defendant, Kyleigh Midkiff, in her pretrial statement, completely eviscerated

Silly Sarah’s Silly claims. She stated that her comment regarding Hadel "assaulting women" was a "true and accurate statement". Midkiff says she saw comments online from other woman stating they were abused by Hadel. Midkiff also claims that another claim where she said hadel owed thousands in child support was also true, providing the DHS documents which showed Blake Hadel did owe thousands in Child support. Kyleigh Midkiff, also made reference in an online comment that “the next picture of Blake Hadel would be his mug shot”, which of course is an opinionated statement.

But throwing the case out was not enough for the court that heard it. The court didn't just dismiss the case; documents show the court sanctioned Blake Hadel under Maryland Rule 1-341 to the tune of **$12,600**. I've looked through the documents, and they refer to this rule, which allows for sanctions for filings made in "bad faith, for an improper purpose, or without substantial justification". In my opinion, sanctions are the court's way of saying, "You wasted our time and you knew this case was bogus, you should not have filed it Silly Sarah." They were, in my opinion, so incensed by the frivolous nature of this case that they actually punished her client for bringing it.

And here’s where it gets even more interesting, during the recent *Barr vs. Porter* hearing in Washington County, where Silly Sarah is the attorney for John Barr. I saw, and Mr. Porter saw, what looked like Blade Hadel and Silly Sarah together, they even left together and stated they were going to a restaurant. So here is my question is Blake Hadel dating Silly Sarah, is silly Sarah being paid by Blade Hadel at all? What’s going on with Sarah and Blake? I would be curious to know does the Maryland Attorney Bar Counsel romantic relationships between client and attorney? I am not making any claims, I’m just asking questions. I mean what is going on here?

Because here is where it gets weirder, Court documents reveal that Sarah Spitalnick was involved in a custody case for Blake Hadel against a woman named Meghan Maggio, who happens to be the close friend of Kyleigh Midkiff. And it seems like both Meghan and Kyleigh have had isues with Blake in the past. In my

opinion, it seems to be a complex web of legal actions where Attorney Silly Sarah is fighting Blake Hadel's legal battles against his baby mama and his baby Mama's friends. But why is Sarah doing this? It would be nice to get an answer to that question, but I think this is a giant red flag, and possibly a conflict of interest. Or maybe, and this is just my opinion, maybe Silly Sarah is just into suing girls that are much more popular than she is… just a thought…

---

**Part 4: The MDEC Misadventures**

**LEVI TRUMBULL:** Now, let's talk about the legal fundamentals. The one thing every lawyer must master is filing documents with the court. It's the bread and butter of the profession. But based on what I have seen; it appears that Sarah Spitalnick has a complete inability to do so. I'm talking about the Maryland Electronic Courts, or MDEC. Her filings show a pattern of deficiency notices. So, with that being said, lets so show you just how bad Silly Sarah is at filing court documents. Roll footage!

**Part 5: A Career in SLAPP Suits?**

**LEVI TRUMBULL:** So, we come full circle back to the lawsuit against Shaun Porter. Given everything we've seen out of silly Sarah, that being a lawsuit against a major law firm that was laughed out of federal court, a representation of a contractor that resulted in a loss, a judgment, and a bankruptcy, and a defamation case that was dismissed with sanctions, and a pattern of basic, fundamental filing errors, it is no wonder silly Sarah would file a case in Washington county, with the possible belief that Washington County Maryland would overturn the Supreme Court in the landmark Hustler magazine case. In my opinion, the porter lawsuit, just like the others, seems to be a cynical and ill-conceived attempt to use the legal system to harass and silence someone.

And while I can't confirm her previous job, her Silly Sarah's LinkedIn seems to suggest she was a bartender before working

as a lawyer, and I think maybe she should consider going back to her previous, much more respectable job. Cuz honey this one just aint working out. You Play silly games and now you win silly prizes.

Let’s turn it over to reaction: